

A
SECOND LETTER
TO

The Reverend Henry Dawson,

BEING A
RESPLY
TO

A PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

*the Genuine Sabbath, or Lord's Day, commonly
called Saturday, vindicated.*

By HERBERT JONES.

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by J. W. PASHAM, in Black-Friars;
EDWARD JOHNSON, in Ave Maria-Lane, and
W. OTRIDGE, behind the New-Church in the Strand.

M.DCC.LXXVII.

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

BEING A

Y L P

TO THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

HERBERT JONES

LONDON

THE NEW YORK

w. H.
S I
UCH
cation
refs to
g fav
conte
not I
I I
Chri
DAY
mist
your
my
er a
d v
ciful
he tr
bu

TO THE

W. HENRY DAWSON.

S I R,

MUCH a length of time elapsed after the publication of the letter, which I had the honor to address to you, that I gave up all expectation of being favored with your sentiments concerning its contents; and began to flatter myself that I had not labored in vain; that, according to my opinion, I had so far succeeded as to convince you that Christians are not reprehensible for keeping the DAY as the Sabbath, or Lord's day. But I was mistaken; since then I have learned that you and your friends had employed that time in weighing my doctrine in law and gospel scales. After a long trial, you report that my doctrine is found wanting*. However just the beam, yet unequal weights appended, may be as injurious to the trader as a false balance. Your scales are just, but your weights are abominable.

* Genuine Sabbath, p. 13.

After waiting several months, from February to the middle of June, one of your publishers presented me with a pamphlet, subscribed with your name. I read it, but could not give Mr. Dawson credit for being the compiler of any part, except the 20th page, wherein you "inconsiderately" and undesignedly" aver that keeping the seventh day is sin; "a sin for which Christ suffered the death of the Cross."

I was sorry to hear, that you went among your acquaintance exacting promises from them not to purchase my pamphlet. Did not this betray fear that your opinion would not bear examination? Surely it indicated a small regard for truth. It certainly was an attempt to deprive your friends of their natural and just right, the privilege of judging for themselves.—But by this time, your fears are dispersed; your spirits are elevated now, that the question is stated and your side is defended and proved, you are grown valiant and champion-like, you throw down your gauntlet, and have it publicly proclaimed from the press, that you are ready to engage in the combat of disputation, any that will enter the list*. You and I have had a *tilt* at each other; I purpose to have one *bout* with your friend, and then to quit the field. In other words, I intend after this to have no more public altercation with you, or to be in fellowship with you, on the subject. I have endeavored to state the truth as it appears to me from the evidence of the holy scriptures. To success I leave to Him, who can only lead us to all truth. That I failed in convincing you of your error I am sorry. That what I have written upon the subject, has been, as you know, profitable to many, I am thankful.—But a letter

* See p. 19, line 21, 22.

being directed to me in consequence of that publication, common politeness obliges me to return an answer. As the contents of the letter are calculated, by fallacious reasonings to conceal the truth from some, and to raise a mist to prevent others clearly to discern and accurately to determine the subject in dispute, it behoves me to endeavor to prevent the reader from being deceived. Above all, as the letter-writer charges my hypothesis with invalidating both law and gospel, I am compelled, by honor and conscience to strive to free myself from so foul an imputation.—Wishing you, sir, a right judgement in all things, I beg leave to withdraw from you, to employ the remainder of my paper in an address to your friend. If this mode of reply should be thought disrespectful, I persuaded myself that the parenthesis, which is at the bottom of page 19 of *The Genuine Sabbath*, will be admitted as a sufficient apology. For therein insinuated, that some other than myself had the honor of writing the letter which I directed to you. An insinuation entirely groundless, altogether *hypocritical*.



To the Rev. Dr. ———

YOUR vindication of Mr. Dawson's Essay on the 10th verse of the 1st chapter of the Revelation was, no doubt, intended for the confirming of seventh-day baptists in their singular observance of Saturday as the true Sabbath. To effect this, you animadvert on a letter, which I wrote to Mr. Dawson; from a repeated perusal of which, you tell me, you found yourself obliged in honor to truth and its divine author to make me *some* reply. As you were persuaded that my premises were hypothetical, the conclusions false, and altogether of such a tendency as to invalidate both law and gospel, it would have been better, instead of *some* you had returned a *full* reply; had noticed and refuted all my arguments, and silenced all the objections which can be made to your opinion and practice.

Purposing that what I am about to write may be decisive, I shall minutely canvass every paragraph of your letter, reply to all that you have advanced, and with meekness, modesty and firmness strive to convince you how weak the cause which you labor to maintain.

I am willing to abide by the controversy as you have stated it, page 1. But for what purpose you introduced the Roman Catholics I cannot imagine, except it were, to make the church of England appear odious, and to charge all Protestants, who differ from you in the day for observing the Sabbath, with an attachment to Popery. Wherein the honesty of this consists, I submit to the judgment of Him to whom all hearts are open and from whom no secrets are hid.

That there was a change of the day from the patriarchal to the Jewish Sabbath—And, that the

obser

observed by the Jews, as the Sabbath, ever since their departure out of Egypt, is the sixth day in rotation from the creation of the world—I have not barely *conjectured*, but affirmed. You ask, “Upon what ground does this hypothesis stand? Do you produce any direct command to this purpose?” Then *modestly* reply, “you do not.”

Had you, sir, paid that attention to my letter, which you profess, had you not purposely avoided what you must be sensible militates against your opinion, you would not have asked me upon what ground my hypothesis stands. For every page of my pamphlet sets forth that, REDEMPTION was the *ground* or occasion of the appointment of the Sabbath day. This is a subject, which you pass over, as if you were as great a stranger to the blessings of it as Pharoah himself.

You pretend that I have not produced any direct command for the change of the day to be observed as the Sabbath. Have I not in page 11, expressly, said, the day when God wrought this mighty deliverance was *commanded* to be had in continual remembrance? and immediately subjoined, Exod. xiii. 3, 5. “Remember this day” &c. Have I not in page 21, referred to Exodus xx. 9, 10, and Deut. v. 12, 13, 14, 15, to make it apparent that there was a change of the day; and have said, “In the former, the reason assigned for observing the Sabbath is, that it should be a memorial of God’s resting from the work of creation. In the latter, as a memorial of God’s redeeming Israel out of the land of Egypt”? Have I not quoted the express *command* for the observance of the week of unleavened bread? Deut. xvi. 8. This feast, ordained to the Israelites at the time of their quitting Egypt, you have not paid any, the least regard to, though it is one of

the strongest arguments in support of my *hypothesis*.

You say, page 17, "Until you prove by the written word, they had a new Sabbath, it will not follow they had a new week." But, sir, if I can prove, on that authority to which you refer, that the Jews had a new week, will it not follow that they must have had a *new Sabbath*? That a *new week* was instituted is so expressly mentioned in the written word, as not to be doubted. See Exod. xii. 15, &c. "Seven days) i. e. a complete week) "shall ye eat unleavened bread, even the first day (of this week) "ye shall put away leaven out of your houses, for "whosoever eateth leavened bread from the 1st "day until the 7th day (a whole week) that soul "shall be cut off. And, in the first day there "shall be an holy convocation (or a Sabbath) "and, (that day se'nnight or) on the 7th day there "shall be an (other) holy convocation (or Sabbath) no manner of work shall be done in them." Then follows the reason for this command. "Ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread, "FOR *in this self same day* have I brought your "armies out of the land of Egypt." Next are recorded *the month*, and the day of the month, when this week was to commence. "In the *first* "month, on the *fourteenth* day of the month at "even (i. e. at the commencement of the 15th) "ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the even of "the *twenty-first* of the month, SEVEN days shall "there be no leaven found in your houses." Was not this a *command* for a *new week*? Consequently, was not a *new Sabbath* appointed?

This institution is enrolled in the code of the Levitical law, and may be seen in chapter xxvi. 6. of that book.—It was repeated by Moses to the Israelites when they were on the banks of Jordan

in these words. "Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, THAT THOU MAYEST REMEMBER THE DAY, WHEN THOU CAMEST FORTH OUT OF EGYPT ALL THE DAYS OF THY LIFE. Deut. xvi. 4.

Is not the above good ground, on which to build my hypothesis? Do not these scriptures contain a direct command to the purpose? Must you not, sir, being confronted with these positive assertions of the written word, confess that my reasoning is deduced from something more stable and certain than "a supposed chronological fact?" The evidence of the three preceding testimonies of the written word proves, there was a new week instituted, and consequently a new Sabbath day appointed to the Israelites at their departure out of Egypt.

Proceed we to enquire how this change of the day of the week for the Sabbath day "can be made to consist with the express words of the fourth commandment."* This you think an insurmountable difficulty.

The reason assigned in the fourth commandment, why men should observe to keep the seventh day of the week a Sabbath to the Lord, is, for, or, because the Lord rested on the seventh day. The rest from the work of creation was to be had in continual remembrance. Therefore the Lord blessed this day and sanctified it, i. e. set it apart from worldly to holy uses.——

Let me ask you, sir, was the Sabbath day never enjoined to men for a memorial of a REST from some other work, than that of Creation? Was it not to be a memorial of the REST from the work of Redemption? Have you never read what God commanded Moses to speak to the children of Israel, when he was to repeat to them the precepts of the two tables? If you never observed it before, please

to open your bible in Deut. v. and see if the 15th verse be not an addition to, and an augmentation of the fourth commandment. This verse is by a copulative connected with, and makes a part of this precept. "AND REMEMBER that thou
 " wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that
 " the Lord thy God brought thee out thence,
 " through a mighty hand and a stretched out
 " arm; THEREFORE the LORD thy God com-
 " manded thee to keep the Sabbath day." This is an express command to keep the Sabbath in memorial of the completion of Redemption.

With just as much truth you may affirm, that this passage cannot be made "to consist with the
 " express words of the fourth commandment," as what I have advanced, concerning the change of the day of the week, for the Sabbath cannot.

Until you have courage enough to aver that the 15th verse of the 5th chap. of Deut. contradicts Exod. xx. 8, 9, 10, 11. all your endeavors to make my hypothesis wear the semblance of invalidating the HOLY LAW, will be weak and fruitless.

If, sir, you should in future, employ your thoughts on this subject, it may be serviceable for you to remember that the signification of the word שבת SABBATH is not SEVEN, but REST, a resting day. Please to recollect that the people of Israel left Egypt on a Friday at midnight, Exod. xii. travelled from Ramases until the sun was up on Saturday, when they halted at Succoth. That day se'nnight, or the succeeding Saturday was יום שבעה i. e. the *seventh* day from their redemption out of Egypt; and was the seventh day of the *new* week of unleavened bread. This and every seventh day in succession was commanded to be observed by Israel and their generations as יום השבת the Sabbath, or the day of rest. In which

which they were to cease from their worldly occupations, and spend the day in divine worship, in prayer and praise.

The fourth commandment was the rule or direction for the *mode* of observing the Sabbath; namely, in ceasing from their worldly work as God had done from his. "Thou shalt do no manner of work," &c. The commandment enjoined the observance of one day in seven as a day of rest, from worldly labor, for the public worship of Almighty God. The change of the day being only circumstantial, the Jews were not freed from the moral obligation of the law; neither had they upon my plan (as you say) nothing to do with the fourth commandment. On the contrary, it was to them an immutable law for the observance of one day in seven as a Sabbath; or day of rest from their worldly employments, to be a day holy unto the Lord; and the faithful among them kept it accordingly.

Again; You farther oppose me with Exod. xxxi. 15, 16, 17, and say, "The reason assigned in this passage for the observation of the Sabbath" (you should have said, the *seventh day*) "is precisely the same with that in the fourth commandment, viz. that God rested on the seventh day." Then, you remark, "that the reason is no way applicable, if it be the *sixth day* that is to be observed." When I read this, I could not refrain crying out, Here is treachery, O Ahaziah! When or where, sir, have I said or hinted that *every sixth day* was to be observed as a Sabbath or day of rest? Such a thought was never in my mind. It would have been an absurdity as great as "the sulphureous power of a law." Yet this is the meaning of your charge if there be any meaning in page 4 and 5 of your letter. How you can cheerfully submit this act
of

of injustice to the judgment of Him who cannot err, I profess not to know.

Had you begun your quotation at the 13th verse, you would not have been at a loss to know why the people of Israel were to observe every seventh day from their Exodus as a Sabbath. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep, FOR it is a sign between me and you. Six days work may be done, but in the seventh (from the 1st day of the week of unleavened bread, for any thing that you can shew to the contrary) is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep שבת a Sabbath," a resting day, throughout their generations "FOR a perpetual covenant, &c." The plain lesson of which is that God's people were to follow their worldly vocations six days successively, but every seventh day they were to rest from the same. This was the injunction. The passage by no means affords you the least support. It does not answer the end for which you introduced it, viz. as being a command for the Israelites to observe the seventh day from the creation as their Sabbath. And since this quotation doth not strengthen your cause, it doth not in the least contradict my hypothesis. The fourth commandment being the direction in what manner a Sabbath was to be observed, viz. by *resting* from all worldly business, and filling up the whole time in private and public worship of God, my change of the day of the week, is not at all inconsistent with the express words thereof; because I acknowledge every seventh day is sacred, and to be sanctified according to the manner prescribed in that precept.

Having, I trust, honestly freed my hypothesis from your unjust reflection of invalidating the holy LAW, I enter with courage on the examination

mination of your table, page 7, which you have dignified with the title of SCRIPTURAL. How well it deserves this epithet, will appear presently.

I venture to lay down as a maxim, that, it is not possible to construct a kalendar, which shall distinguish the day of the week in which the people of Israel went out of Egypt, which shall in every respect correspond to the antitype thereof, the transactions of the week, when Christ was crucified, without the assistance of the particulars, recorded of the week of unleavened bread, instituted at the period of the Exodus. I suppose you readily consent to this:—then, sir, permit me to apply the days of the week of unleavened bread and passion week to your scriptural table; and you and our readers will be convinced what an unscriptural appearance it will make.

Moses saith, the 15th of the first month is the feast of unleavened bread. You acknowledge this was the day of “the departure out of Egypt,” * you allow it was the first day of the feast. Then must the days of the week in that month, according to your table, have been as under,

Day of the Month.	Day of the Week.
15. 1st day of unleavened bread, which you say was the	5 or Thursday.
16. 2	6 Friday.
17. 3	VII Saturday.
18. 4	1 Sunday.
19. 5	2 Monday.
20. 6	3 Tuesday.
21. VII. or Sabbath	4 Wednesday.
22. The morrow after the Sabbath	5 Thursday.

It is universally known that our Lord was crucified at a passover season. The day when

the moon was at the full, or 14 days old. That on Friday the 14th day of the month Christ died; on the 15th he rested in the grave; on Sunday the 16th he arose; that day, which we call Sunday, was, and is *the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath*. The two days, Saturday and Sunday, have ever been together; and the days of Passion-week were in a regular succession from the time of the institution of the Passover. If *the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath* this year, and in the year of Christ's crucifixion was on a Sunday; then according to the course of nature, *the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath*, so far back as the time when Moses with the Israelites first kept the feast of unleavened bread, must also have been on that day which we call Sunday—but you say it was on a THURSDAY. Look at your table.

If Israel went out of Egypt on the 5th day of the week, on a Thursday, as appears from your table, then continuing the weeks till the time of our Lord, it must have fallen out that

Christ was crucified on Wednesday,
lay in the grave on Thursday,
arose on - - - Friday,

All which is egregiously contrary to the known fact, for nothing is more certain than that our Lord suffered on a Friday, and arose the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath, or on a Sunday. Thus demonstrably plain is your table proved to be erroneous, contrary to scripture, to the laws of nature, and the common course of time.

Another particular in your table must not pass unnoticed. You judge that a transfer of the Sabbath from one day in the week, to another, “until prefiguration should give way to reality, “is imaginary, invalidating both law and gospel.”

"pel." But what is making a transfer, to an absolute breach of the holy law? Not by one, or two individuals, but by the whole nation of Israel, including MOSES, the law-giver, and AARON the high-priest of the people Israel.

According to your table, p. 8. the 15th of the second month was a Sabbath. On that day they came to the wilderness of Sin. Every thing, related by Moses of that stage, proves it could not have been a Sabbath; for instead of being a day of *rest*, it was a day of great *fatigue*; they travelled a long and wearisome journey, which was forbidden by the law. Instead of a day of worship, of praise and thanksgiving, it was a day of murmuring, dissatisfaction, and rebellion against God. By making the 15th of the second month a Sabbath, and a day of journeying, "you inconsiderately and undesignedly" charge MOSES, AARON and all the congregation of Israel with a breach of the fourth commandment. How you will free yourself from the crime of vilifying the Lord's people, I know not, except by publicly confessing you were mistaken, and acknowledging that you are sorry for your fault.

Should you recriminate, by referring me to my own calculation, wherein it appears that the 15th of the *first* month was an original Sabbath; that from the commencement of this day, which was at the evening of the 14th, Israel journeyed, and thereby broke the Sabbath day. I acknowledge, and alledge, that as this was done by the express command of the LORD, *that* Sabbath day was desecrated. This is an argument of great force in favor of a NEW Sabbath day, which consequently was to be on *another* day of the week, than the former.

They were out of Egypt, on Saturday the 14th of the first month, and halted at Succoth. The next day,

day, which was an original Sabbath, they continued their journey, and so on until the close of the 6th day, when they passed the Red sea, and on the morrow, or 7th day from their departure they *rested*; spent it in praises to God for their miraculous deliverance, the completion of their REDEMPTION from Egyptian bondage. From that time to this the Jewish Sabbath has been every seventh day in succession.

We must acknowledge that God, as the law-maker, has an indisputable right to suspend the force of, or to make alterations, if he sees fit, in the laws, which he gives to his creatures. Our blessed Lord, in the judgment of the Jews, frequently transgressed the Sabbath, by doing and permitting others to do those things which the Jews said were not lawful to be done on the Sabbath day. Whenever He was, for this, called to account by them, he alledged, that "He was the Lord of the Sabbath, consequently, might do what he pleased with his own." And further he told them, that the "Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," that it was designed and set apart for mens use and benefit. But what our Lord did himself, and what he permitted his disciples to do on the Jewish Sabbath, were strong intimations that their Sabbath was near expiring, and with other things in the ceremonial law was ready to vanish away.

I hope, from this examination of your table, you are convinced how defective it is; how far from determining the day of the week when the Jews went out of Egypt, consequently you see its deficiency in proving SATURDAY to be the original Sabbath and *seventh* day in succession from the creation of the world.

The next matter for consideration is your long quotation from the *Breviarium Chronologicum*. Mr.

Locke

Locke's encomium is undoubtedly a good recommendation ; but as I am an entire stranger to the book, I must beg leave to use the privilege granted to prisoners at the bar of our courts of judicature, viz. that such of the jury, as the prisoner disapproves, may be dismissed. Though the gentlemen may be good men and true, yet I do except to *Strauchius*, *Josephus Scaliger*, *Behmius*, *Dorsheus*, and *Frankenbergerus* being of the jury at this trial; choosing rather to abide by the verdict of MOSES the Hebrew philosopher and divine, and those faithful men, who were witnesses of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. They do not grant that from the citations, which you have made from the *Breviarium Chronologicum*, which you call *facts*, arises a solution of the question, namely that the seventh day, which God from the beginning sanctified, is the day "observed by the present Jews and a few Christian protestants." Neither from any conclusion drawn from the said *facts*, is Sunday, which I aver to be the seventh day in rotation from the beginning of the world, "*an imaginary, unscriptural, transferable sixth-day Sabbath.*"

In the 13th page is contained the second part of your charge against my hypothesis, namely that it "invalidates the GOSPEL."

Let us hear your assertions. "According to your plan Christ did not obey the law perfectly, or in every particular; neither undergo the whole of the penalty for men's transgressions of the law; that he violated the fourth commandment; that he was made a curse for men for their violation of *nine* commandments only; that he never fulfilled perfect righteousness; nor endured the curse; consequently, if your scheme be true, all men are yet in their sins; the work of redemption is not complete, so there is no salvation."

B

Now

Now for your method of proving the above. Because " your plan teaches that Christ kept that " day which was the *sixth* in rotation from the " beginning." Because if " Christ, as you say, " kept the *sixth* day, then he hath not wrought " out such righteousness, as is answerable to the " imperfections attending mens observation of " the fourth commandment."

What if Christ kept the *sixth* day of the week, a Sabbath, doth it follow, that on any other day he was unholy? Was there a day, a moment in his life, when he was not *holiness* to the LORD? Did he not always, invariably, constantly, perfectly, do all those things, which pleased his heavenly Father? If, sir, if I were sure no other eyes than yours were to see this, I would desist from a further refutation of this part of your ungenerous charge, and would only tell you, how sorry I am, that you should have a thought, that our Lord was so much like one of us. But as other persons will probably read this, it will be needful to say something further.

Christ observing the Jewish Sabbath (which permit me to suppose was the sixth day of the original week) did not violate the fourth commandment, for, remember, sir, Christ was made under the law, subject to obey the ceremonial as well as the moral. As concerning the flesh, he came of the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; was of the line of Judah; a native of Judea; by religious profession a Jew. He was " the minister of " the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers," it behoved him therefore to fulfil ALL righteousness; every tittle of the *ceremonial* law. If, as most assuredly, the whole Jewish œconomy was typical, then the Jewish Sabbath was such, a memorial of typical redemption, having respect to that which

was spiritual; it *behooved* Christ as the minister of the whole ceremonial law, as a Jew, and as that promised person, who was to fulfil, and having fulfilled, to abolish the ceremonial law, among other things, to keep THAT Sabbath ordained to be observed by the Jewish nation.

Until it be proved that the Sabbath day was enjoined only as a memorial of the *Rest* from creation, and not of the *Rest* from redemption: Until it can be evinced that MOSES in delivering the words recorded, Deut. v. 12, 13, 14, 15. freed the Jews from the observance of the precepts of the fourth commandment: Until you can make it appear that there was a day in the life of our blessed Lord which he did not sanctify; which he did not keep holy; or in which he was *less* holy than in any other day—Your charge, that, on my plan, Christ did not in all things fulfil the law; and was not made a curse for men's violation of but nine commandments only, will in the judgment of every discerning reasoner be deemed frivolous, malicious and unjust.

As to any testimony that the 600,000 people, whom you introduce, p. 15, gave of Saturday being the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, I find none, in any of the passages which you have transcribed. It is true, they *promised* (but a promise and a testimony are essentially different). "All that the LORD hath spoken, we will do." Whether they were as good as their word, I leave you to determine, when you recollect how many of this number fell in the wilderness for their disobedience; how few of them were permitted to possess the land of Canaan; and what the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others, have written concerning this people's neglect of the Lord's Sabbath.

Thus, sir, after a close but fair inspection into your manner of weighing in law and gospel scales; detecting your false weights, your fallacious reasonings; and producing the standard, the record of Moses and the evangelists, my doctrine is found to be just on the balances of the sanctuary.

It only remains to make some remarks on the minutiae of your vindication.

I have nothing material to object against the *length* of your Sabbath. Whether you date it at sun-setting or sun-rising, I wish you, all the day long, the enjoyment of those blessings, which are the earnest of that rest, which remaineth for the people of God.

That "the sulphureous power of a fiery law is an absurdity," is too gross to be denied. That this absurdity is to be found in Mr. Dawson's Essay, you may satisfy yourself by reading *page 9, line 21*.—That such, as do not keep Saturday for the Lord's day, are, in Mr. Dawson's judgment, exposed to "the sulphureous power of a fiery law," and the wrath of an infinitely holy God" may be seen in *lines 14, 15, of the same page*. These expressions being in that part of Mr. Dawson's Essay, which sermon-makers call the application, no doubt this absurdity is threatened to all Christians, who observe Sunday as the Lord's day. What the cause of your saying "this absurdity is not to be found in my Essay"—I must leave.

Great as the senate of this nation is, yet your citations of the dates of the *Votes of the Honourable House of Commons*, as an authority for Saturday being the Lord's day, only proves your poverty of arguments. When men are drowning they will catch at a twig. *Sabbatum* at no time was a word current in the Latin tongue, any more than *Frankenburgerus* was the name of a Roman.

The whole pretence; that either have of being natives of *Italia*, is the *termination*, which is tacked to each. The ancient Romans had no such word as *Sabbatum* in their language, any more than they had a word for a *demiculverin* or an *horse pistol*; yet, *Littleton's Dictionary* will furnish you with Latin for all three.

In this quotation, as in several others, you forgot the English of שבת *Sabbath*, instead of remembering it signifies *REST*, you misconstrued it by *the seventh day*; of which had you been mindful, while you was transcribing, *Sabbati 25 die Januarii, 1777*, you would have recollected that, *that day* was observed by the *honourable members* not as a day of *REST*, but as a day of *business*, a day for doing the *work* of the nation. And, as a Jew may keep his rest on the sixth day of the week, had you retained the English of שבת you would not have asked this important question. "Can any one imagine that Saturday's being called the *Sabbath day*, was meant to signify its being the *sixth* and not the *seventh* day." And, with our leave, sir, as none of the *Honourable House of Commons* are *Jews* or seventh day Baptists, was the subject in dispute between Dr. — and H. J. to be decided at the bar of that House, I venture to say that every one of the 558 members, should, *nem. con.* declare that Sunday, not Saturday, is the Lord's day: your appeal therefore to the House of Commons, or to their votes, can be of no service to your cause.

Of similar advantage is the tables of time, weights and measures, which are bound up with many bibles put out by authority." By what authority they were inserted in our bibles, I know not. Of those in "that small neat bible with notes, lately published by Mr. *Pasham*," I can inform you. The printer, sir, had a spare

leaf, he was unwilling his customers should pay for two blank pages; at his desire I copied them from some tables which I found at the end of a small bible printed by *Alex. Kincaid, Edinburgh, 1775*, and Mr. *Pasbam* inserted them in the place, which you have noted. That our *English* translation of the holy scriptures is "put out by" Royal "authority" is most true; but that the tables of *time, weights and measures*, which are frequently bound up with our bibles, received the same sanction, I never remember to have read; nor ever supposed, till now, that any person deemed them a part of the infallible word of God. To say, "your CHURCH has distinguished them "in this manner," is something very like imposition.

When you can prove that the word *SUN* signifies *FIRST*, as you pretend to do in a parenthesis, p. 18, then I will acknowledge that my "attempt in every view is irreconcilable with the "bible Sabbath." But till then I shall pass over the whole of what you have said about the *dominical letter*, and the appointment of *Easter-day*, considering them as having no more concern in the subject than the dates of the *Votes of the Honourable House of Commons*, and the table of time in *Pasbam's* bible.

Concerning "the silence of the scriptures respecting the alteration of the patriarchal Sabbath to the *Jewish*, and of the *Jewish* to the *Christian*." And, "of the sufficient record to convince every one that such alterations have been made," I have to allege as follows,

The evangelist *John* writes, that "he was the Spirit on the LORD'S DAY." If that was, as you endeavor to maintain, the same the Jewish Sabbath, a Saturday, pray favor with a tolerable reason why *John* made an alteration in the name of the day? Why did he

call it the Sabbath? It would not have been wandering from, but keeping *properly* close to the subject, if Mr. Dawson had *effayed* to account for this difference of expression, especially as Mr. Dawson supposes that the *Christian* Sabbath is on the same day of the week as the *Jewish*. As Mr. Dawson neglected to oblige the world with the reason why the evangelist called the Jewish Sabbath the LORD'S DAY, it would not have been foreign from the purpose, if you sir, as the vindicator of Mr. Dawson had supplied this defect. Every body knows that the Lord's day means the day of Christ's resurrection, which was the day after the Jewish Sabbath. A moments reflection must surely convince you and every one that the day in which *John* said he was in the Spirit, was *another day* than that, which the Jews kept for their Sabbath. This passage, therefore, though it be not an *express command for*, yet is *not totally silent* respecting the alteration of the Sabbath day from the *Jewish* to the *Christian*. And when rightly considered, it will be evident, that *Revelation* i. 10. proves the reverse to that for which Mr. Dawson selected it. He *effayed* to convince his readers that the Lord's day is coincident with the Jewish Sabbath; but without a doubt St. *John* used the name to distinguish it *from* that day.

The Lord's day, most indisputably, means the day when Christ rose from the dead. This day was observed as a day of religious worship in the earliest ages of Christianity. The learned Dr. Gill, (whose memory I suppose you revere,) on the subject of Public Worship, has these instructive observations: "On the day, which Christ rose from the dead, he had finished the great work of our REDEMPTION and salvation, and so CEASED from his work, as God did from his. After our Lord's resurrection from the

“ dead, we *never* read, throughout the whole new
 “ Testament, that ever the Jews seventh-day
 “ Sabbath was kept by any Christian assembly;
 “ only the first day of the” Jewish “ week. The
 “ observation of this day is confirmed by the
 “ practice and examples of the disciples of Christ
 “ and of the first churches. For, (1st.) On the
 “ very day Christ rose from the dead, which was
 “ the first day of the” Jewish “ week, the disci-
 “ ples assembled together and Christ appeared in
 “ the midst of them. On that day sevensnight
 “ they met again and Christ stood again in the
 “ midst of them; now though there had been a
 “ seventh-day preceding this, the disciples did
 “ not assemble on that day but on this and Christ
 “ with them. John xx. 19, 29. (2d.) The
 “ apostles met together on the day of Pentecost,
 “ which was the first day of the Jewish week.
 “ Just before our Lord’s ascension, he ordered
 “ his disciples to wait at *Jerusalem* for the pro-
 “ mise of the Spirit; and though there were two
 “ Jewish seventh-day Sabbaths before Pentecost
 “ from the time of his ascension, yet it does not
 “ appear that they met together on either of
 “ them, but on THIS day they did. (3.) It was
 “ on the first day of the” Jewish “ week that the
 “ disciples at *Troas* met together to break bread,
 “ when *Paul* preached to them, *Acts* xx. 7. Now
 “ he had been there seven days before, so that
 “ there must have been in that time a seventh
 “ day of the Jews; but it does not appear that
 “ he and they assembled on that day; but only
 “ on the first” of the Jewish week, “ and that
 “ for religious worship, he, to break bread, to
 “ celebrate the supper of the Lord, and they, to
 “ hear him preach. (4th.) The apostle *Paul* gave
 “ orders to the church at *Corinth*, as he had to
 “ the churches of *Galatia*, to make a collection

“ for

“ for the poor saints on the first day of the”
 Jewish “ week, when met together, 1 Cor. xvi. 12.
 “ which shews that it was usual to meet on that
 “ day; yea it IMPLIES AN ORDER, or the *renewal*
 “ and confirmation of an order, to meet on that
 “ day, or otherwise how should the collection be
 “ made on it. In an ancient copy, mentioned
 “ by *Beza* on the place, after the *first day of the*
 “ *week*, it is added, by way of explanation, the
 “ *Lord's day*; and also in others, and so *Jerom*
 “ explains it. (5th.) This is the day *John* means
 “ by the *Lord's day*, when he says, *I was in the*
 “ *Spirit on the Lord's day*, Rev. i. 10.”

From these observations made by the Rev. Dr. Gill, it is clear that an alteration of the day of the week for the Sabbath was made, though it be not expressed in so many words in the holy Scriptures. If this be granted, and I do not see that it can be denied, then the alteration from the *patriarchal* to the *Jewish* Sabbath is equally certain, being proved by the *appointment* of the feast of unleavened bread. Thus the silence of the Old and New Testament respecting a *command* for each is *similar*, and yet “ there is sufficient record “ that such alterations have been made.”

If I may be credited, I had, when I sat down to write to Mr. Dawson, “ no inclination to substitute probability for proof.” Because the Scripture doth not mention the day of the week in which the people of Israel sang the song of thanksgiving, as related in *Exod. xv.* I chose to deliver my sentiments, rather, by surmise, when I could have produced many cogent reasons to have convinced, that it was on a Saturday, that hymn of salvation was sung.—But as the note, in which this was expressed, has given you occasion to say, “ in my opinion, you are so far from having “ proof in support of your hypothesis in general, “ that

“ that you have scarce the shadow of probability “ through your letter,” I hope, sir, since I have followed you through every line almost of your vindication, that you will, for that regard, which you profess to have for truth and its divine author, retract this your opinion.

The 20th page, containing a collection of texts of scripture cited as reasons for keeping Saturday as the Lord’s day, is so *impertinent*, that it would be loss of time to shew the impropriety of those passages being introduced.

I trust, sir, the foregoing pages will be deemed a *full*, and *fair* reply to your vindication. I am not conscious of having omitted returning a just answer to any of your arguments. I have considered every paragraph, and have done by you as I would others should do to me, when truth is the subject of contention, examined justly, and, by the word of God, determined impartially. If you are not convinced of your error, that your dis-sension from the church in this matter is unwarranted : If you should still persist to charge my *hypothesis* with a tendency to invalidate law and gospel : If you purpose to write again on the subject—do for the honor of truth and its divine author—return *direct* answers to the following queries. Should you write again and evade giving a *full* reply, I shall conclude you do so entirely from want of ability. Should this be the case, and you should still persist in your present practice of keeping Saturday as the Lord’s day, since you cannot prove that day to be the seventh day, since it is most certain that the Lord’s day is the day following the Jewish Sabbath, you must in the judgment of the world, and by your own conscience be condemned for persisting in error against the clear light of truth ; and for continu-

ing a practice which is contrary to the word of God.

To preserve a distinction of the several subjects, I beg leave to present my queries in the following classes.

I. Was the Sabbath day instituted to be a memorial ONLY of the *Rest* from the work of creation? Was it not also a memorial of the *Rest* from the *temporal redemption* of Israel from Egypt? Is it not to be observed now in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, and as an anticipation of that *Rest*, which remaineth for the people of God?

II. Were not the day of the month, and the day of the week, in which God redeemed Israel, commanded to be kept in continual remembrance by that people and their descendants? Were not the passover and the week for the feast of unleavened bread instituted to be memorials thereof? Were not these typical of Christ's crucifixion, the merit of his sacrifice, and of his resurrection?

III. Was there not at the Exodus an alteration in the computation of *the months* of the year; so that *that* which was really the *seventh* month was to be accounted the *first*; and that which was really the *first* was to be accounted the *seventh*? Can it be averred that God in this command transgressed the laws of nature? If God were pleased to order a similar change in the computation of *the days of the week*, so that *that* which was really the *seventh* day should be accounted the *first*; and *that* which really was the *first* should be esteemed the *seventh* day of the week—would men, who obeyed this injunction be regarded as violators of the fourth commandment?

IV.

IV. When the observance of the feast of unleavened bread was enjoined, was there not a **NEW** week instituted? Could there be a new week instituted without a **NEW** seventh day? According to the tenor of the fourth commandment must not *that* seventh day be the Sabbath? Were not they, who on *that* seventh day, ceased from their worldly works, as God did from his, *observers* of the letter and intent of the fourth commandment?

V. Was not the 15th day of the VIIth or first month, the *first* day of the week of unleavened bread? Consequently was not the 21st day of the month the *seventh* of unleavened bread and their Sabbath*? From that day to the coming and death of Christ must not every *seventh* day in succession have been the Jewish Sabbath? Has not the Jewish Sabbath ever been the day preceeding the Christian? Were we to continue these two days as far back as the time of the Exodus, will it not be most clearly apparent that the 14th of that month was, not *Wednesday* but, **SATURDAY**? Therefore is it not undeniably evident that *your* table is unscriptural and most egregiously erroneous? That mine is perfectly scriptural, and according to truth?

VI. Did the apostles and first converts to Christianity *ever* after the resurrection of our Lord, observe Saturday as the Sabbath day? If

* Day of the Month.	Day of the Week.
15. - - - - -	1 Day of the Feast.
16. - - - - -	2
17. - - - - -	3
18. - - - - -	4
19. - - - - -	5
20. - - - - -	6
21. - - - - -	VII.

you

you say they did, name the chapter and verse in the New Testament, which authorizes you to make such an affirmation.

VII. If the apostles and primitive Christians kept Saturday as the Lord's day, Who were the Christians that first observed Sunday? Mention their names; the place of their abode; under what emperor or king they lived; and in what year of our Lord the day was changed.

VIII. If you compute backward from the time of the resurrection of Christ to the Exodus in a regular succession of weeks, remembering that by the *new* week of unleavened bread *one whole day* was gained, must you not be convinced that the 15th of the VII or first month must have been the patriarchal Sabbath, and that day of the week which we call Sunday?—Must you not, then, sir, be under the necessity of putting an end to the dispute? Drop your vindication? Confess your mistake? And acknowledge with me that **SUNDAY IS THE SEVENTH DAY IN SUCCESSION FROM THE CREATION OF THE WORLD?**

I am, with all respect,

Your willing Servant,

AUGUST
15th, 1777.

H. JONES.

Lately Published,

And Sold by E. Johnson, *Ave Maria-Lane*, and
W. Otridge, behind the *New-Church, Strand*.

THE *Good Samaritan*. A Sermon preached in
the Parish Church of St. Andrew, Holborn,
on Wednesday the 16th of November, 1774, on
Occasion of Opening the *Misericordia Hospital*.
Price 6d.

The Precepts of the Levitical Law still in force.
A Sermon preached in the Chapel of King Henry
VIII. at Westminster Abbey, on Sunday August
1775. Price 6d.

Aulim Luz. A Sermon preached at the Open-
ing of Northampton Chapel, formerly called the
antheon, in the Spa-Fields, Islington, on Sun-
day July 6, 1777. Price 6d.

By HERBERT JONES.

P R O P O S A L S
FOR
Printing by Subscription, in one Volume, 8vo.
A
D I S S E R T A T I O N
ON THE
TWENTY THIRD CHAPTER
OF
L E V I T I C U S,

BEING THE
SUBSTANCE OF SEVERAL SERMONS

PREACHED AT THE PARISH CHURCH OF

St. ANN BLACK FRIARS; St. JAMES DUKE'S
PLACE, THE LOCK CHAPEL, &c.

On the following Subjects,

The Sabbath-Day,		The Feast of Weeks or Pas-
The Passover,		tecost,
The Feast of Unleavened Bread,		The Feast of Trumpets
The Offering of the Sheaf of		The Day of Atonement,
first Fruits,		The Feast of Tabernacles.

By HERBERT JONES.

C O N D I T I O N S.

- I. The Work shall be neatly printed on a good Paper; the Price to Subscribers will be Three Shillings, to be paid at the Time of Subscribing.
- II. When a sufficient Number of Subscriptions are received, the Work shall be printed.
- III. The Names of the Subscribers shall be prefixed.